

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_70206
Title of the Manuscript:	Development and Evaluation of Herbal Tablet Formulations of <i>Emblica officinalis</i> Gaertn. Leaf Extract
Type of the Article	Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>1- Novelty of the study was not mentioned. Authors have to clarify this point.</p> <p>2- The quality of manuscript writing, data presentation and language manuscript required to be revised accurately</p> <p>For example; the paragraph in the abstract; The selection of excipients and procedures adopted to manufacture the dry extract obtained by hydroalcoholic extraction of <i>Emblca officinalis</i> Gaertn were found to be result-oriented as in is evidenced by the various investigation of the current research work. <u>This require to be rephrased.</u></p> <p>3-The reference(s) used or followed for dose calculation was not mentioned. The authors should mention them.</p> <p>5- Which references were used for the selection of the extract dose of 250mg and the excipients as well. Authors have to submit the references.</p> <p>6- The references of Disintegration and dissolution methodology used in the manuscript were not mentioned. The authors have to submit them.</p> <p>7- Concerning the HPLC method used for drug analysis, there was no results of method validation presented in the manuscript. Clarify?</p> <p>8- The name of the internal standard used in the HPLC analysis was not mentioned, its source of manufacturing and on what basics it was selected. Should be submitted.</p> <p>9- The discussion is very weak, and it seems that it is result part and not discussion one. The authors should rewrite and resubmit this part in the right form and meaning of discussion, where, references are required which either support or oppose the results obtained by the authors from the study.</p> <p>10- Ethics committee approval for the study was not mentioned. Please clarify?</p> <p>11- Pharmacokinetics parameters, which are very important parameter, were not presented in the study. Please clarify.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1- In methodology section under title; Preparation of plasma sample, the authors had not mentioned that the blood sample was collected in a tubes containing anticoagulant in order to obtain plasma. Please clarify?</p> <p>2- In the conclusion, the authors had to mention that clinical studies are recommended for further approval of the best formula as preclinical studies are not enough.</p>	
Optional/General comments	None	

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> Yes, the authors had not mentioned the ethics committee approval obtained by the authors on the pre-clinical study protocol which was performed on the animals.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nagwa Ali Sabri
Department, University & Country	Ain Shams University, Egypt